

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

**Listing of Claims:**

1. Canceled

2. Canceled.

3. Canceled.

4. (Currently Amended) An object supporting unit wherein at least a rear end side of an object is supported in a box body in a horizontally-movable manner and a front end side of the object is supported in a manner movable back and forth along a floor at least through a rolling supporting body so as to allow the object to be drawn forward from a stored position in the box body; wherein the rolling supporting body comprises a free motion rotating body having an upper end making an abutting contact with a downward facing surface of the object and a bottom end contacting the floor, and the free motion rotating body supports the front end side of the object by making a rolling movement; wherein the free motion rotating body is supported by the object in a manner capable of being suspended through a rail and a rotor at a position floating from the floor through the rail and the rotor at a time when the object is initially moved and the free motion rotating body moves underneath an inclined face arranged on the downward facing surface of the object so as to lift the front end side of the object at a time after the free motion rotating body contacts the floor during an operation to move the object; wherein the rail is connected to the downward facing surface of the object; wherein the rolling supporting body further comprises a bracket; wherein an axis is connected to the bracket and the axis supports the free motion rotating body; wherein the bracket is connected to the rotor and the rotor engages the rail.

5. Canceled.

6. Canceled.

7. Canceled.

8. Canceled.

9. Canceled.

10. (Currently Amended) The object supporting unit described in claim 71, wherein a stopper is arranged at a part of the rail to hold the rotor temporarily at a front end portion of the rail until the free motion rotating body contacts the floor.

11. Canceled

12. Canceled.

13. (Previously Presented) The object supporting unit described in claim 4, wherein a width of the free motion rotating body exceeds one third of a width of the object and the free motion rotating body is arranged at a position supporting a middle portion along the width of the object.

14. (Previously Presented) The object supporting unit described in claim 4, wherein the object is a drawer and the box body is a drawer storage portion of a desk.

15. (Previously Presented) The object supporting unit described in claim 14, wherein the drawer is arranged at the lowest part of the drawer storage portion or the drawer is a body arranged over the entire drawer storage portion.

16. (Previously Presented) The object supporting unit described in claim 14, wherein the drawer comprises a bottom wall and three standing side walls wherein one standing side wall is orthogonal to a direction accessible to an article to be stored is open.

17. (Previously Presented) The object supporting unit described in claim 15, wherein the drawer comprises a bottom wall and three standing side walls wherein one standing side wall is orthogonal to a direction accessible to an article to be stored is open.

18 (Previously Presented) The object supporting unit described in claim 15 wherein the free motion rotating body travels a linear distance along the floor at half traveling speed of the object traveling a linear distance along the floor.

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of December 19, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim 4 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 7. Accordingly, claim 7 has been canceled. This amendment raises no new issues or new matter.

It is believed that this response fully addresses all remaining issues. In the interest in advancing prosecution to a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if disagrees.

### Drawings

In regard to the endless track, claim 3 had been canceled hence this objection is moot. 37 CFR 83 applies to the claims. See section (a).

(a) The drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the *claims*. (Emphasis added)

Section (a) must apply if an objection is made under 37 CFR 83. Since the claims do not contain an endless track, this objection is improper and should be withdrawn.

### Claims

Claims 4, 7, 10, and 13-17 stand rejected as indefinite. Claim 4 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 7. Claim 7 has accordingly been canceled

It is believed that "at least a rear end side of an object is supported in a box body in a horizontally-movable manner" provides sufficient connection information. The object has a rear side and the rear side is supported by a box body such that the rear side of the object can move (e.g. a drawer sliding out of a chest.) The relationship between the box body and object (e.g. a drawer) is clearly defined and one skilled in the art would understand the same.

The Examiner is correct that a floor does not form part of the invention. It is merely used as a reference for how, for example, the front end side of the object is supported in a manner movable back and forth along a floor.

It is respectfully requested that since claim 4 has been amended to recite the allowable material of claim 7, that the remaining issues regarding claim 4 have been addressed.

In regard to claim 18, attention is drawn to page 9, lines 14-19, of the specification and Figures 2-4. This passage fully supports that the free motion rotating body travels a linear distance along the floor at half traveling speed of the object traveling a linear distance along the floor. Based on this description, one skilled in the art would have selected the appropriate rotating body to achieve the result of claim 18.

Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 4, 13-15 and 18 stand rejected as unpatentable over Rapp in view of Ronda. Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected as unpatentable over Rapp in view of Ronda in view of Shapleigh. Claim 4 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 7. Claim 7 was indicated to contain allowable subject matter and was not included in these rejections. Withdrawal of the instant rejections is requested.